



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from

The Institute of Museum and Library Services through an Indiana State Library LSTA Grant

PROCEEDINGS AT THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNUAL LINCOLN DINNER OF THE REPUBLICAN CLUB OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK. IN COMMEMORATION OF THE BIRTH OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN. WALDORF-ASTORIA, MONDAY, FEBRUARY THIRTEENTH, NINETEEN ELEVEN.



NEW YORK: NINETEEN ELEVEN

A B R A H A M L I N C O L N

EMANCIPATOR · MARTYR · BORN FEBRUARY 12, 1809 · ADMITTED TO THE BAR 1837 ELECTED TO CONGRESS 1846 · ELECTED SIXTEENTH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, NOVEMBER, 1860 · EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION JANUARY 1, 1863 · RE-ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, NOVEMBER, 1864 · ASSASSINATED APRIL 14, 1865 □ □ □ □ □ □ □

OFFICERS OF THE CLUB

President
SETH LOW

1st Vice-President
NATHANIEL A. ELSBERG

Recording Secretary
MERRITT G. HAVILAND

Corresponding Secretary
WILLIAM W. BRYAN

Treasurer
JAMES L. WANDLING

LINCOLN DINNER COMMITTEE

LISTON L. LEWIS
Chairman

LLOYD C. GRISCOM
Vice-Chairman

WILLIAM H. EVANS
Treasurer

HENRY W. GODDARD
Secretary

EDWARD M. MORGAN

ROBERT C. MORRIS

LUTHER B. LITTLE

E. W. BLOOMINGDALE

LUCIEN L. BONHEUR

EDWARD F. CRAGIN

WILLIAM H. WADHAMS

SETH LOW, *ex-officio*

S P E A K E R S

THE REVEREND DOCTOR FRANK W. GUNSAULUS
"Abraham Lincoln"

THE HONORABLE GEORGE von L. MEYER
Secretary of the Navy
"The Navy"

THE HONORABLE EMORY SPEER
"The South and the Isthmian Canal"

EX-PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT
"Abraham Lincoln and
Progressive Democracy"

THE PRESIDENT OF THE CLUB, MR. SETH LOW

I will ask the Reverend Doctor Silverman to invoke the divine blessing.

GRACE

Our Father, who art in heaven and on earth, Creator, Governor and Preserver of the Universe, the source of all blessing, we thank Thee for these bounties. We are grateful for that immortal soul in whose memory we meet to-night. We thank Thee, O Lord, for this land of liberty and pray that Thy Providence may rest over it forever. May Thy blessing be with us now and always. Amen.

ADDRESS OF MR. SETH LOW PRESIDENT OF THE CLUB

Ladies and Gentlemen, Guests and Members of the Republican Club, Fellow Citizens and Fellow Americans:

The Republican Club of the City of New York welcomes you here to-night in the beloved and inspiring name of Abraham Lincoln (Applause).

We gather here year after year on Lincoln's Birthday fondly to recall the man and his achievements; to pay grateful homage to his memory, and to baptize ourselves anew, if it may be, with his spirit. Lincoln's problems are not our problems; but if we are to solve our problems of to-day as Lincoln and the men of his generation solved theirs, we must do it in Lincoln's spirit, with the same national point of view, with the same largeness of heart, with the same great patience and with the same complete trust in the plain people.

A year or two ago it was my good fortune to take part at Alton, Illinois, in the 50th anniversary celebration of the Lincoln-Douglas debate, which was held in that place. There I came upon this incident. Our townsman, Horace White, whom many of you know as an old man now, was then a reporter for the newspapers; and he went through that pilgrimage with Abraham Lincoln throughout the whole debate. One day he said to him: "Mr. Lincoln, why don't you turn the laugh oftener on Judge Douglas?" as of course Lincoln was abundantly able to do. Lincoln's reply was: "Well, first of all, I am so dead in earnest about this business that I do not feel like turning the laugh on anybody; secondly, I doubt whether turning the laugh on a man makes many votes. In the last analysis it is the argument that counts." I think we must approach our problems of to-day with that same dead earnestness, and we, too, must remember that in the last analysis it is the argument that counts.

But the President of the Republican Club has not the floor this evening. The time is dedicated to our guests who are here to speak to us at the invitation of the Republican Club; and I have the very great pleasure of introducing to you as the first speaker a man whose reputation as a preacher is nation wide, and a man who as the head of the Armour Technical Institute is now carrying out in practice that old Biblical

idea, that the head cannot say to the hand: "I have no need of you," and the hand cannot say to the head: "I have no need of you." Dr. Gunsaulus is one of the very few men born in Ohio whom it has been my privilege to know, who does not hold public office; but he comes from Illinois, the State from which Lincoln went to the Presidency, and in Illinois, like Lincoln, he has pretty much everything he wants.

I have now the great pleasure of introducing Dr. Frank W. Gunsaulus:

ADDRESS OF REVEREND DOCTOR FRANK W. GUNSAULUS

Mr. Toastmaster, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a very uncomfortable incident, I assure you, which it is mine to meet, that I am announced as one who is to deliver an oration on Abraham Lincoln. You cannot conceive of an oration as the fitting mode of portraiture for this simple and sublime man. For there was never an influential personality in human annals, save William the Silent, whose temper of soul, insight, deliberation and faith in the unspoken and unspeakable right and its future so lifted him beyond and so set at naught the oratorical speech as have the mental and moral excellences of Abraham Lincoln. He belongs, as the vigorous Stanton said, at his passing from us, "to the ages." The orator's art is evanescent. He must have his triumph at the moment. The painter leaves his canvas; the architect lives in his cathedral; the poet reigns through ode or sonnet; the sculptor fastens his achievement in marble; the musician bequeaths his efforts at expression through his score; but the orator's audience will be gone soon, never to reassemble, and unless his oration is so free from oratory that it may safely be left to the dryest of printed pages, its own fires duly quenched, he must be content with results that illy consort with the calm and majesty, the clear-eyed and half-adoring ages which belong to Abraham Lincoln.

When that great road which patriotism has contemplated, is completed between Washington and Gettysburg, it has been proposed by a distinguished friend of mine who does not care for orations, that ever so-called orator may be compelled to walk and meditate on the fall of oratory for the entire distance from the Capitol of the nation to that glorious place made so renowned in the history of public speech by something which was more than an oration—the message of the greatest man of his time in the greatest hour of modern history, Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg address.

I wish to-night to accomplish another purpose than that attained by elegance of speech or brilliancy of portraiture. It is my desire simply and in the spirit which I hope the genius of Abraham Lincoln has given to us, to note something of the educational value of Lincoln's character and career in the

republic. And, not vainly to recur to what I have said, one of the very first things which I think needs to be considered with reference to this matter of public speech and Lincoln's total influence upon the American mind is here illustrated. I mean the excellence of his by-product. He was not a great orator of either the academic or popular type. Yet he has influenced American speech more than even Webster and Wendell Phillips. He has taught us the supremacy of character, the might of intellectual integrity, while he has shown that eloquence is the illumination of things true, lovely, and of good report, that the brain and heart and conscience of humanity need only this illumination to obey these divine behests; that the simple is the sublime; and that he who would be trusted to lead a whole people themselves made eloquent with a cause must himself be the mouthpiece of sound thinking, noble emotion, and unfailing conscience, whose messenger he is, and whose message when truly proclaimed is always eloquence. Without detracting for an instant from the genius of Edward Everett, we often make the comparison between the oration of Edward Everett and the simple and sublime statements of our great President at the dedication of the Gettysburg battlefield. He was following then the fortunes of true Republicanism, of real Democracy, for the units of democracy—the material out of which republics are to be made and by which they are to be saved—these abide in the hearts, in the consciences, in the brains of all men; and after all they are most deeply obedient, not to the swift and splendid movement of the orator, but rather to the earnest, sincere progress in men, of reason, of love, and of a sound mind. The higher art which never knew an artifice in Lincoln's utterance will appear when the loftier arches of the temple of liberty and law shall spring upward from the granite bases of his address at Gettysburg. It has the immortal and republicanizing function abiding in his personality as a man of men and in his ideas and ideals which command all men.

Compare for a moment, my friends, the great orator, William Ewart Gladstone, with Abraham Lincoln. Ask to-night if there has been in the tide of human affairs a notable volume of utterance so certain to be forgotten by the coming student of those fundamental principles which create and re-create nationalities, as the magnificent eloquence of the great English Commoner. On the other hand, years as they pass make it clear that at the moment when the oratorical genius of Glad-

stone, the oratorical passion, as Bagehot tells us, which led him to see everything as material for his superb art, had seized this material and he stood in the House of Commons, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, to say that Jefferson Davis had "created a new nation"—at that moment which was nearly fatal for his renown amongst the lovers of justice and liberty, he was only oratorical. Afterwards, when he had, as he says, learned more of the safety of free government, his was often an eloquence so appealing and so clothed upon with the instinctive and prophetic vision of Lincoln that America is willing to hear again and again the praise he gave our Constitution, whose spirit was saved by Lincoln. When a moment has come which creates for the orator his pitfall, when the imagination and the fancy, and that fusion of thought and feeling, that radiancy of feeling over thought, have complete control of the mind; when all this gives to a Gladstone his intellectual and spiritual outlook, there stands at Washington, in all the certainty and light of his moral consciousness, a plain man, whose eminent contribution to the eloquence of mankind is not so much a critical personality, who, highly employed, despairs mere oratory, as a real messenger who is incarnating a message that must be made real and plain to the common people, whose interpreter and prophet also he is. Lincoln's attitude and temper were anti-monarchical. He never dictated, nor was the national mind ever overborne or even dazzled by him. Here is a characteristic which inheres in our republicanism. The uncle of Washington stated it when he said to Washington as a young man, and he was right: "Avoid a dictatorial style." There is a human way of saying anything, and there is a way of saying the same thing which puts that same thing outside of the interest of an audience. This is of the unrepiblican manner. It inheres in a despotic type of mind.

The oratory which announces itself, either when mounted upon the traditions of the past or some lonely eminence of genius, which is isolated from the experience of the public mind and imperious over it, has come with the history of monarchies, rather than republics. The oratory of republicanism never speaks at a man, hardly ever to a man, but always with a man. Such was the eloquence of our greatest republican, Abraham Lincoln.

The secret of Abraham Lincoln's power in speech lay in the educative value which he gave to the process of reasoning, the growth of conscience, the nourishing of noble emotion in

the national consciousness. It was not a performance before men; it was not a conflict with men; it was an exciting within men of all generous impulses, the revealing within men of high and original vision, the emancipating and strengthening from within men of each man's unsuspected moral purpose, and the touching of strings of music within the human soul which the soul had never named to itself; and all the power of Abraham Lincoln in the creation of that new republic, which is a republic of thought and aspiration and high ideals, was manifested in the astonishing mental and moral utterance by which he simply gathered the manhood of his audience and gave it all back to his audience in fresh statement and winged power. In him, as he spoke, every man saw glorified that which every man had contributed out of his own soul to the great and revealing soul of the orator himself.

As Abraham Lincoln enters his second century we see the same form and feature which have educated republican sentiment of the finest type and hope. There drift from the regions to which he has gone the same genial winds bearing fragrance and inspiration and music; but it is all a part of his essential republicanism. It is so near, so human; it so commands by persuading us of its excellence. No wonder is it that so many still seek to look like him or speak like him. In this many have been feeble and they have driveled, of course. As Lincoln has survived our oratory about him, so he passes on, having successfully lived beyond the story teller. In it all, more and more, we behold a man without whose entire personality it is impossible to conceive of the greatest fortunes of the republic. So much an unit was he, such an integral career was woven of one and the same texture, so constructed was his eminence of the constant and inviolable moral fibre, that we must have him all, and all of him, for our education.

The first thing that comes to a man interested in the education of the republic, it seems to me, is the emphasis which Lincoln's character and career give to his early advantages, the advantages most of all likely to be possessed, if not at first enjoyed, by a majority of those that compose the republic—and by these I mean of course what he loved to call "the common people." I mean what he also called "the plain people." What were some of these advantages which were made such because they were and are for this kind of American, for Abraham Lincoln? They were mighty; they were all-powerful in the creation of his character. Goethe says that our

greatest education is the education we give ourselves. Lincoln educated himself in the best of all schoolrooms, if one is seeking a fresh and fadeless sort of power. Nature—American nature—was his schoolhouse. Skies that bended over his head are our symbols of infinity. The waters that ran close to his feet are yet filled with music. The stars at night and the clouds by day guided the mysterious fancies of his wondrous nature. They will guide ours, if we are willing. All the winds that came upon the cheek of this boy came with an influence that entered by thrilling sympathies into his thoughts and character. He gained, then and there, the most luminous, juicy and growing vocabulary which can come to any speaker. I mean the vocabulary of nature. He learned from nature, this great schoolroom, by such processes of growth as forbade him ever being satisfied with or misled by the machinations of the politicians or efforts of any to substitute machinery for growth in nation-building. Give a man nature in the early years and put him into any profession where he shall have to explain or enforce truth, and he will use the language of growth. He knows the tragedy and mystery of the breaking seed. He is not surprised at the rain falling on the just and the unjust. He is an evolutionist, not a revolutionist. He cannot endure for a moment unnatural processes which are proposed through legislation alone to the end of manufacturing a state of affairs which, therefore, has no inner vitality. It has also no power of growth and, therefore, it is denied the possibility of being improved. All the way through Abraham Lincoln's political manner of thinking there is the movement, the method, the ideal of growth as in nature; and all the way through his dealings with men there come out of that great schoolroom in which he sat as a student under the tutelage of the Almighty, illustrations, metaphors, sly hints that are as sweet as the wind and as bright as the stars, and the use of nature's own phrases by so sincere a man made the national mind more natural and vital. Has your boy the advantages of such a schoolroom?

Another advantage this boy had was the advantage of poverty. Nicholas Poussin, having failed to reach the height towards which his genius seemed to point and having thus disappointed his best friends, was met one day by a serious-minded artist who knew beauty and truth together, and he said: "Poussin, you lack one thing, and only one to make you a great painter." I suppose the rich painter put his hands

in his pockets and touched the coin so much like the coin which you and I grasp in days of bargain and sale and luxury, when false ideals of life and education permit us to neglect the unpurchasable. He was thinking he might be able to buy this superior thing. "No," said his friend, "the thing without which you shall not become a great painter is something you cannot buy; it is poverty." When God gets in earnest about a man on this planet, he strips him of everything that shall in any way overweight him or hinder his course towards the realizing of the truest ideals. All the way through the history of that moral genius which identifies itself with the great experiences of nations, there work the healthful limitations that keep the soul strong and the organizing elements of humanity in their richness and their activity. These are met in the gift of poverty. He had another immense advantage in his education. He was a man of labor. Has your boy that advantage? Is the American youth of to-day limited in any possible manner so that, as Emerson hints, like the shot in the steel walls of the cannon there is an inevitable direction in his life? Are we not denying our boys to-day the culture of labor? Here was a man whose brain reached to the very ends of his fingers. Gray matter had gotten into that man's arms. His sinews, strong as steel, were as responsive to that brain as the strings of a violin were responsive to the touch of Paganini. The whole man was surcharged with all those spiritualities that abide in the finer, and higher dome of soul. You will never have a great American until every American in the most republican manner shall win in himself the gift and privilege of labor. No man is educated in his head alone. The church can take the heart. The school can take the head. Life's necessities can take the hand. The school will never be a great school until it takes all of the man, head, hand and heart. Until the head is filled with heart's blood to give these ideas warmth and passion, and until the hand has done what the head dreams and what the heart feels is duty, there is no clearness. There is no intellectual mastery until a man can thus distribute his brain over his entire body and pervade and unify his faculties with soul.

Abraham Lincoln was trained, as great men have been trained for national and international revolution and evolution, in the camp of the foe. When Providence wished to lift Holland out of the perils of the sea and make her master of the ideals of those Puritans and Pilgrims who should come to her

coast to learn how to hold town meetings, when the Holland represented at this table and in this city in such generosity of genius and public spirit was to hurl the Spaniard back, God had educated his William the Silent in the court of Charles the V. of Spain. When there came the moment in this same long conflict for justice and freedom and the battle was to be fought for republicanism and righteousness in England, God gave to the blood of the Stuart a kinsman of Charles the I., the impulse and the ideal; and the young Roundhead felt the muscles of the Cavalier at Hinchinbrook. So Oliver Cromwell was prepared by the royalist to take off a royal head. When heaven had gathered the peoples of earth to look toward the American colonies, and here God sought to deliver the land's destiny and give her a spiritual fortune through the self-education of free men under law. He educated His Washington in the army of a British soldier; made him a surveyor at the order of the British throne. At length, when God would smite slavery and destroy its hateful presence, He bred His Lincoln in a slave State, educated his conscience in sight of the monster's activity. In those early hours when he was recipient of all the impressions that unfold in the lifetime of wisdom, his open eye beheld its tyranny and cruelty. Lincoln never mistook the mighty power of greed, pride and ambition behind human slavery. There he became familiar with the resources and the tremendous activities that came out of the haughty and athletic wickedness of the slave power, and his knowledge of the better humanity at the South, which, like Jefferson and Washington, hated or feared slavery, never failed him.

This was not an uneducated man. For the most part, ladies and gentlemen, this is the kind of education that the great mass at the base of this pyramid called the American public must have. Out of these advantages the best servants of progress have been educated—shall we not say, without them none has been educated. It would be better indeed for the top of the pyramid if we had the education of nature, the education of the limitations of poverty, the education of labor, all so continuously working at the bottom that our democracy on which we rest so broadly-based might guarantee us a true aristocracy. This boy's whole life gave the impulse of naturalness and an essential republicanism to all his activity, because he was not a child of privilege, and because he could certainly understand this, that at the very bottom of this pyramid is a democracy out of which there shall come the aristocracy

of intellect and the aristocracy of character whose leader he was.

The essential power in any truly republican state must always lie in its ability to continue intelligently the history of the past. The great man of a republic is a man who must so honor the past in his own personality, in the quality of his mind, in his temperament, in his attitude towards all questions of life, as to bring the whole past up to date in a living personality and influence. He must harvest the years that are gone in order that in his seed bag there may be the most golden grains for the larger harvest of the future.

Here was the secret of the greatness of Abraham Lincoln. Here is his essential republicanism. He knew enough of man's soul and history to see that republicanism is not a matter of yesterday. He had so vast a retrospective, that, when he spoke, he had room for the massiveness of his thought; and freely did he move around with the great centuries behind him. They were in his consciousness. He saw that just government received its invincible impulses toward freedom from the alliance of freedom and law in the long past, with which he was perfectly familiar. He had the first profound and enlightening history of man in the Bible which he knew so well. As he walked with Moses out from Egypt and followed him as he should follow him at the last in history, dying as Moses died this side of Canaan, never realizing here how much man loved and honored him, cruelly murdered as Moses was kissed to sleep by the lips of Almighty God, he could not stop at Sinai. He went on in his own moral development and he saw while he mused at the foot of the cross on Calvary the true vision of man's worth. He obtained there an estimate of the common man, so much more clear to him in the long years of his public work, that whether black or white, bond or free, he knew that a man in God's eyes was worth the tragedy of the Cross.

He saw that the marks of valuation upon any man were marks which had been placed there through the agonizing hours of Gethsemane and that midnight of Golgotha. Here was and is your truly progressive Christianity, and here was and is all advancing republicanism. He saw that institutions exist for humanity, and not humanity for institutions. He studied the Man of Galilee as He took into His one hand a certain institution, the Sabbath, a most delicate thing, the most elusive thing that any thinker may handle, for it is not a visible institution, but an invisible one. He saw Him put

humanity in His other hand, and behold, the Sabbath was outweighed by humanity, and Jesus Christ said, "The Sabbath belongs to man and not man to the Sabbath." He had found the illumination of a principle. So Lincoln demonstrated that an institution at best is only a constitution embodied, and it can be reformed in the interest of humanity or it may be abolished, and constitutions may be amended.

He knew as he studied the advance of man in accordance with the conception of man's worth whose truth was established at that Cross, something of the necessary features to be anticipated in the picture of humanity. Have I anticipated, and do you say Lincoln had no such culture from books as will permit us to believe that he was conversant with these principles or under the sway of these inspirations? Let us look at the facts. So far as I have investigated, book for book, this man Abraham Lincoln had the best library of any public man of his period. Five of those books constitute a library of higher educative quality than any five feet of books I ever heard of, especially if this five-foot library be without the Bible and William Shakespeare. What were five of the books? The life of Washington, the Constitution of the United States, Shakespeare, Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, and above them all, the Bible. He may have added Robinson Crusoe and Aesop's Fables. Recent investigation upon my own part reaching through twenty-five years and to many of Lincoln's intimates makes me sure of the five books just mentioned. Many another man as Lincoln did has learned English history from Shakespeare, and then relearned it by the light of the progressive revelation of truth in the Bible. His story-telling genius was not less grandly imaginative at a solemn crisis, because it was liberated by John Bunyan. There was as much of the mystic in Lincoln as in Dante. But his mysticism was never mystiness. He found not only history, but a vaster look and appreciation of the geography of human nature delineated by Shakespeare. His study of Washington, whose work he was to continue and help to consummate, as Washington continued and helped to consummate the work of the Pilgrim Fathers, Oliver Cromwell, the Norman Barons at Runnymede, and Alfred who was nine centuries away—this study of the man Washington, along with his study of the Constitution which Washington had made possible, and Lincoln was to make a living thing, brought the soul of our emancipator and statesman into close relationship with all these movements and

men which have advanced the cause of just and free government, each occasion surpassing the preceding in its ample statement or fine achievement as the ages came and went. Every such man as Washington as he is studied in the frame of the event he precipitates and masters, or in the monumental word he leaves for us, seems to say as he passes on:

"Upon our heels a fresh perfection treads
Born of us, yet fated to excell us."

This "fresh perfection" was Lincoln, and he comprehended the past so fully and vitally that all the present he lived in, it blossomed for the future. Consider the deeper history of that State-paper he left to his time and nation—the Emancipation Proclamation! So clearly did he comprehend the advance of liberal ideas, the conquest of justice over injustice, that the past easily fell into his hands. How gracefully this gaunt, awkward, magnificent figure gathered the past, and set himself walking from century to century with the great men! Here were the eminent milestones—the State-papers of Anglo-Saxon civilization, every one of them born out of a revolution produced by the fundamental ideas which Lincoln found in the Lord's prayer with its fatherhood of God and its brotherhood of man. All these revolutions are wheels within wheels; they serve the larger evolution. Here, a thousand years ago, stood Alfred, with his ten dooms and his treaty of Wedmore, which was the result of an education, the result of the rude eloquence sounding in the woods and on the shores in behalf of the rights of the common man—the man without privilege. The careful and serious measurement of the future which had been developing with this eloquence was a measurement of the strength and of the influence of the foe. This first State-paper was only a beginning. Years passed, and this most radical product up to that time, the treaty of Wedmore, had become a platform. On that platform, there stood in that age men like the Lincoln of ours, men of reason, men of judgment, men of great kindness, men of pervasive goodness. They argued and appealed, and out of their eloquence there came the second great State-paper, Magna Charta. Then respectability in politics said "This is impossible; beyond this is midnight or peril," but at once that great document became a platform. Standing on Magna Charta, another race of reasoning patriots came, who argued and placed before the popular heart inspiring ideals, and out of that great State-paper, Magna Charta, there came triumph-

antly the Mayflower compact. Here conservatism stopped, and Europe said, "It is dangerous for society that men should go a step further than this." But the fact was that the men who reasoned out Alfred's treaty of Wedmore and compelled the utterance of the Magna Charta were only primitives and progenitors, and as the treaty of Wedmore invited an eloquence and stimulated an argument that produced Magna Charta, so Magna Charta stimulated an eloquence and nourished an argument that produced the Mayflower Compact. And here was a new platform. Here stood another race of eloquent men. The argument, the assault upon wrong, all these came; and out from that argument and assault against injustice there came the Declaration of Independence. Conservatism cried, "This is the end!" But was the human soul dead? Had God abdicated and left the Divine throne vacant? Were the elements that create human liberty and law and foster civilization to fail to make good the doctrines of that Declaration of Independence? The continuity of progressive ideas is like a chain with links of steel, or rather like an evolution in which the lower finds its reason for being as it is completed in the higher form. Alfred with his treaty of Wedmore made necessary the Great Charter with the Norman barons, and the quickened mind of a new era made necessary the Mayflower Compact among men like Bradford and Carver of Plymouth. The same forces made necessary the Declaration of Independence as it left the hands of Thomas Jefferson. Was civilization to stop? Sometimes, when I hear the solemn protestations of what is called conservatism, it seems to me that only a total lack of understanding of human history can account for the somnolence and the dreaming out of which these feeble objections to progress come. This tremendous stream is organized in the heights of the ideal, this flood of our ideas, hopes, admirations and loyalties in the direction of the good which is seeking the sea and will never stop until it reaches the ocean, singing its way down from the mountain snows in the land of high emprise, has its impulse from the throne of God—and I aver that the thought that this current shall stop with even our present achievements in popular government is the contradiction of all intelligence and of all history. It was as certain that if Alfred and the treaty of Wedmore in time so worked their ideas into men that they produced Magna Charta, and Magna Charta and the Norman Barons likewise produced the Mayflower Compact, and the Mayflower Compact and the

Pilgrims produced the Declaration of Independence, then a new era of argument and eloquence would come. It did come, and in turn there came also the greatest State-paper of them all—the Emancipation Proclamation of Abraham Lincoln. Every great leader of Republicanism must be himself the true recipient of historical currents. He must do more than embody them in institutions. He must incarnate and communicate their spirit, their purpose, their achievement unto and into his fellow men. Because he made true republicanism contagious and progressive, Abraham Lincoln is worth more than anything Abraham Lincoln said or did. The personality that conveys this quality of mind to all others—the quality of mental self-respect with the ability to receive out of the past and give unstained to the future all precious legacies—this is indeed the central living shrine of the very genius of our republican nation.

The conflict thus attained—for heroic humanity attains crises—was indeed a collision of the mightiest ideas of government the world has known—the two aged, and yet unaging conceptions of human society. The quivering point of the tragedy was this, that it all occurred in the soul of Abraham Lincoln. The two seas met and swirled in his great heart. There were two distinct and powerful currents of political philosophy, very old indeed, which swept over the England of the Seventeenth Century; and they came to this land. Both of them proceeded visibly out of the heart of what came to be a civil war—the only civil war with which our own in 1860-1865 may be compared. One of these streams arrived and was content in our Southland, created the city of Jamestown, then a hamlet, named after a royal despot, a king who persecuted Puritanism because absolutism in government was hostile to its ideals. Propitious, indeed, was every soft wind; and the soil welcomed to its luxury the grace and gayety and more formal religiousness of the Cavalier. On and through the South this movement made its way, after its own manner. It preserved its aristocracy of manner and its pride of birth. To our Northland there came another movement—that of the English parliamentary body which had sought to recover the prerogatives of popular government from the Crown which had usurped them. In other towns and by other names, these two movements had met in the olden time. Only a little time agone, upon the hills of Nottingham, and upon the hills of Northampton, they had

marshalled their armies. Here at Nottingham stood the royalists and the regiments of the popular party. Here was privilege; and there upon the hills of Northampton stood equal rights. One was armed in the person of the Cavalier; the other was armed in the person of the Puritan. Here on the Nottingham heights is an idea, and that idea on this side is that "might makes right." Here on the Northampton heights is the idea that "right makes might." On this side also, where the Cavalier camps is the idea that government belongs to the classes and not to the masses. On the other side where the Puritan camps is the idea that government belongs to the masses and not to the classes. At Marston Moor these gigantic ideas collided. But they could not conclude their contest, even through a long war at that age, in England. It required a greater field. Perhaps it may be a somewhat doubtful tale, but we have loved to think of a night when Hampden and Cromwell, holding the Great Remonstrance in their hands, agreed to come to New England if the Great Remonstrance failed to pass Parliament. It did not fail. But the vision implied therein was too large for the old England, and the idea that government belongs to the masses and not to the classes, that right and right alone is might, did perforce reach and constitute a New England, as the other idea came with the Cavalier to our beautiful Southland and ordered its life and progress. The next engagement of these same forces was our first revolution, under Washington; the latest, let us hope the last by the sword alone, was our second revolution, under Abraham Lincoln.

Now I am not here to-night to tell you that the Cavalier had everything bad, and the Puritan everything good. New England held slaves also, but slavery did not and could not pay in a territory dominated by the ideas of Puritanism. We have lost much in the North, indeed, because the Puritan was so far separated from the Cavalier; and in the South we have lost much because the Cavalier was so far separated from the Puritan. But their conceptions of government were here. Here they battled, contending, at first not one against the other, but together against a common foe, when Washington, the child of the Cavalier, unsheathed his sword under the elm at Cambridge and in the land of the Puritan. Never, not even then, had these ideas met in such relationship that their power could be tested. Each waited the contest, until slavery stretched its black hand out for our American territories.

Never until the awful fact of Civil War came, out of the eloquence of Webster and Hayne, and out of the willing heroism of the American people to meet a dire necessity; never until the atonement had to be made for all the years of wrong, did these ideas confront one another in all their strength. The glory that we ascribe to our God to-night, the gratitude that we give to Heaven, in my judgment, reaches its highest point of praise, when we thank our God that, in Abraham Lincoln, the South and North met each other. In this man there were the Puritan and the Cavalier; he was a man of the South with the ideals of the North. This mighty heart felt the contending armies within its own throb of pain which is usually the pain of progress.

The coming ages will consider what it meant—such a mighty interchange of personalities and ideals in him! It was manifestly important that he should be a man of the South. His sympathies as a man, his genial soul so like the climate, so like the loveliness of the home of the South, his whole nature touched, vivified, warmed, fructified by the influence of the South, in a thousand ways—these play within the glory of Abraham Lincoln. Heaven be thanked for this, above all, that in spite of the sting and the slander of the long Civil War, there never was a serious claim that he did not love the South. His clemency and justice with mercy was his tribute to his sympathy to the South.

This is the Republicanism that we need, in all the crises of our national life; for here was a man who gathered into a heart that broke with agony, these contending currents, which lifted Cromwell and Hampden and Rupert and Charles the First into eminence and tragedy. Into one heart all these came; into one brain these were found entering, slowly, until at length, at last, the war being over, he was incarnating both North and South. There is no other figure in history, so far as the record of civil wars is made, that indicates in the slightest degree, a comparison with this man in his ability to unite, in spite of their war, dissevered sections and contesting ideas. The manhood that Abraham Lincoln will inspire will always have the rigor and vigor of the Puritan and the aspiration and grace of the Cavalier.

Finally, my friends, in our history which is still to be written, we shall find nothing so attractive as the ability which grew out of all these events, to engage or guide or lead differing men, variant mental moods and apparently antagonistic

personalities. It was into Lincoln that there came both the Cavalier and the Puritan; and it was because into Lincoln's hour of writing the second inaugural there came and were entertained in his brain Webster with his reply to Hayne; Clay, with his speech of 1850; Jackson with his decisive word and veto against nullification,—it was because into that comprehensive mind these men could come and move easily, that the fate of the Republic was so comprehensive in its beneficence. The catholicity of the man, the large hospitality of his soul,—these, and the training of our leader which invited the society of these illustrious souls from the history of the past and the experience of the present of which he was master, made it possible when he came to deal with the future which his young manhood saw before him, for him to include in every public action to manage and to direct almost a multitude of men who could agree on nothing save loyalty to him. Apparently antagonistic minds came into the kindly grip and obeyed the ardor and the conscience of this mighty man.

I think of your Seward with his culture and his heroic pioneer work as an anti-slavery man, manifesting an ability to write a State-paper so great as that which crossed the sea, manifesting also a greatness under his leader of such a sort that this same document did not cross the sea until Abraham Lincoln had made such changes as saved us from war with England. I think of Stanton, imperious, irascible, singularly able, forthright as a patriot, a man of high traditions; of Chase, with his Olympian forehead and his boundless ambition, minister of finance, master of jurisprudence, of all that Cabinet formed of such sinew and nerve, and think also of this plain but lofty man gathering them all into his hands. What genius, also, to discover and sustain, when he resolved that he would carry forward the impulse of Republicanism by putting a sword into the hand of one of the most renowned heroes that ever lived, your father, Ulysses Simpson Grant!

Republican leadership, ladies and gentlemen, is the expression of that power in a man which enables him so to respect the conscience and abilities of other men with whom he is associated, that, like excellent pieces of artillery, he may turn these instruments of warfare in the direction of a righteous conviction and thus execute the judgment of Almighty God. Let the Republicanism, which is enough honorable to follow, be loyal to the power of such men who gather the whirlwinds and transform them into a thunderbolt against any

wrong which creates a new crisis of national life and progress. There was Wendell Phillips, of whom the South said he was "an infernal machine set to music;" the orator of all orators, but he was also impatient and hostile, until Lincoln brought him under the spell of a patience more powerful than his words of flame. Lincoln-like, our Republicanism must be so mighty a stream that whatever honest idealism may do shall be swept in its current and hurry on the advance to the sea. Lincoln could do much that he did, because Phillips had followed Edward Everett from platform to platform at the time when Mr. Everett and Robert C. Winthrop were trying to re-unite the States, by adding stones together to make a monument to George Washington, who hated slavery. As I say, he followed Everett with his portrait of Washington; but Phillips painted another portrait, and this was one of a man as black as midnight, painted to make the nation see that a white soul under a black skin means yet a man. When the orator went out to see the unfinished monument at the Capitol City—for God had ordained that it should be impossible to complete a monument to George Washington that by any subterfuge whatever should perpetuate the slavery which he tried to expel from the American continent, he said to Mr. Lincoln's friend, "You tell Mr. Lincoln that even yet I am saying that men may pile their monument to the clouds and they may build it of marble or of granite; but if it is put together by injustice, the pulses of the weakest girl will in time beat it down." My own father told this to Mr. Lincoln, and the President thanked God for the orator. There were tears upon the haggard cheek, and they were tears that had not dried, in the tremendous passion of the hour when Charles Sumner entered the room of the President. Only the day before, Mr. Beecher, with his overflowing heart and his manly patriotism, had been there. "What shall I do with all these good men?" said he, "God has created these men, and they are great men. We must be great enough to work together." I call that true Republicanism. The reverence which Abraham Lincoln had for true-hearted men had its roots in his appreciation of the fact that goodness is greater than greatness. He saw that statesmanship is the art of finding in what direction Almighty God with all good men are going and getting things out of God's way which, by God's grace, is also the way of excellent humanity. Everybody may help, not because he is great enough, but because he is good enough. So clearly did he understand this, that when Sumner came with a little

flag made for Abraham Lincoln and sent to him by a Massachusetts girl, and out of her poverty, and the scholarly Senator said what is yet true, that "the red is for valor, the white is for purity, the blue is for justice," Abraham Lincoln said, "We will make all these things true; all these things shall be true." I seem to see him standing now, looking back upon the problem and its glorious solution. The voice of history is saying all these things are true; the flag is safe; and the Republic shall endure.

PRESIDENT LOW:

I want you now to stand and drink to the health of the President of the United States!

I have just been handed this telegram:

"The White House, Washington, February 13, 1911.

LISTON L. LEWIS,

Chairman, Lincoln Dinner Committee,
54 West 40th Street, New York.

Please express to the members of the Republican Club and to their guests my great regrets that I cannot be with them this evening to honor the memory of Lincoln. May I say to those present what I said in Springfield last Saturday, that I sincerely hope that, with the aid of the present National Art Commission and inspired by the zeal that the love of Lincoln prompts in every heart, the Commission just authorized to determine upon a suitable Lincoln memorial in Washington, may find a proper national expression of the love and gratitude of the country toward her greatest son.

(Signed) WILLIAM H. TAFT."

PRESIDENT LOW:

The next speaker is doubly welcome, first, for his own sake, and second, because he represents here the national administration. Before I present him I want to call attention, just in a word, to two of the recent actions of President Taft which seem to me, at least, really Lincoln-like in their quality. I refer first of all to his appointment of Mr. Justice White to be Chief Justice of the United States. I cannot imagine anything that would have been more gratifying to the heart of Lincoln than to know that the time had come when an ex-Confederate can be placed at the head of our highest court by a Republican President with the unanimous delighted sympathy of the entire nation. The second thing which I think to be Lincoln-like in its statesmanship is Mr. Taft's proposal of reciprocity with Canada (great applause). You may criticize it if you will in detail; but it is nation wide in scope, and it is inspired by the vision of a statesman. It places at the services of the commerce and industry of the United States as freely as if they were our own, all the great natural resources of Canada; and it gives to our manufacturing interests a larger area within which to standardize their goods. Germany standardizes for Germany, and France standardizes for France. It is already one of the great advantages which our manufacturers enjoy that throughout the American Union business is on so large a scale. When you add to that the opportunity to standardize for this vast new region and for the great population that will dwell there, a man must be dull indeed in his imagination if he does not realize that President Taft, in taking as he has opportunity by the hand, has given to this Nation a wonderful chance to enjoy even greater prosperity than heretofore.

Just a word about the speaker himself. It was my good fortune to work with him last year when I was a member of the Hudson-Fulton Commission, and I want to say that the City of New York owes to Mr. Meyer, then as now the Secretary of the Navy, the greatest possible debt for his cordial and efficient co-operation in that celebration. I tell you that in the hope that as I present him to you now, you will give to him the welcome that he deserves at our hands.

ADDRESS OF THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, HON. GEORGE VON L. MEYER

Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the Republican Club, and Mr. Chairman:

As you know, in the navy we have no politics, and therefore it is a rare occurrence for me, and a privilege also, to stand before such a Republican audience as I see here to-night.

It is said that every wise man is not always a good man. We know that every good man is not always a wise man; but to-night I am sure that every man here is a Republican, and that every Republican, as I look around, is a good Republican. (Applause.)

I do not want to sail under false colors or give you the impression that I have had no experience in politics, because when I tell you what they were, I think you will all agree with me that I have had considerable. I was Postmaster General for the last two years of Theodore Roosevelt's administration, and there were some politics going on that last year. I have also been a member in the past few years of the National Committee, and for that reason very briefly I am going to call to your attention that the Republicans not only of this State, but of the country, have got about 18 months to get together. They have got to sink differences and they must to show team work, because in any tug of war the team that pulls together pulls the other men over the line. The same in a crew; the winning crew must pull together, and so must we if we want to get out of the rain (no matter if you spell it with a "g" or not), of the Democratic Party. We have also got to have a platform which we can all stand on. The President of the United States, William H. Taft (applause), has given you one plank in a platform which your chairman has referred to as a reciprocity plank. I have seen the wage-earners' wages increase, and to my mind the farmer in the United States, and the farmers in Canada are working very much on the same level; therefore, the competition which the farmer will meet from the farmer in Canada is not a severe one or an unnatural one. It is the middleman who may lose the enormous profit he has been making, and he can well afford to lose some of it, because the necessities of life should come down, and therefore, gentlemen, I want to assure you that the President of the United States has this very much at heart.

There is a saying that you can lead a hen up to the incubator, but you cannot make her shell out. Now, the President has led reciprocity up to Congress, but I don't know whether she is going to shell out the votes or not, but I know you gentlemen of this organization, and like organizations throughout the country, can be of immense assistance in forming public opinion, and urging your Congressmen to support the President in this statesman-like measure. Because it has got to come, and surely will come. If it comes during this session, there will be time to demonstrate that it is not injurious to the farming interests. We heard the cry of free leather, and little or no damage was done. We heard the same about reduction in lumber, and we are now hearing it through the National Grange, about the interests of the farmer; but the interests of the farmer will not suffer; the interests of the consumer will be greatly benefitted, because it will increase the supply, and therefore, we should bear that in mind and work for the consumer as well as the farmer. But, gentlemen, I came here this evening with the understanding that I should speak on a certain subject, and therefore I am not going to take your time further as regards politics, but I want to touch on the navy in the time of Lincoln, briefly; on the navy of to-day, and also on Lincoln's interest in the navy.

It is perhaps not generally known that Lincoln's military activities during the Civil War included naval operations as well as military operations on land. His orders and instructions to commanders of joint expeditions required the most perfect co-operation. He did more than merely approve plans submitted to him; he originated many of them. His mind readily solved most of the war problems submitted to him, though the men and means were not always available for success.

Lincoln had the greatest confidence in the integrity of Hon. Gideon Welles, his Secretary of the Navy, and in the efficiency and ability of Captain Gustavus Vasa Fox, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy; through the latter he maintained close relations with all naval operations.

Throughout the war Lincoln's custom was to spend a portion of every evening with Captain Fox in the telegraph office at the Navy Department, and through his relations with him and the Secretary of the Navy he was in close touch with practically every detail of naval operations of the Civil War, including all independent and co-operative movements, and he

clearly defined the relations between the naval and military services as strictly co-operative, rather than subordinating one to another.

Lincoln is reported as saying: "The Mississippi is the backbone of the rebellion; it is the key to the whole situation; while the Confederates hold it they can obtain supplies of all kinds, and it is a barrier against our forces."

Lincoln's personal interest in Farragut's campaign was so great that when the Admiral hesitated about ascending with his ocean-going vessels, from New Orleans to Vicksburg, Lincoln sent him, through the Navy Department, imperative orders to proceed up the Mississippi to meet the fleet of the Mississippi River flotilla from above.

His admirable judgment is evident in all his orders regarding naval affairs during his entire administration. While entirely ignorant of technical and tactical details, his power of logically arranging groups of facts gave him a clear insight, and, better still, real foresight in all larger strategical questions.

In Lincoln's time the largest ship was the Niagara, a screw vessel of 6,000 tons. Her complement was 30 officers and 400 men. No gun of the type used on vessels from 1861 to 1865 fired a projectile that could penetrate the armor of the modern battleships.

The Monitor, completed in 1862, was the first step toward the modern Dreadnaught which was launched in Great Britain in 1906. The first English Dreadnaught had a displacement of about 18,000 tons and a battery of ten twelve-inch 45. caliber rifles. The battery of the Monitor consisted of two eleven-inch smooth bore guns, firing projectiles weighing 170 pounds. She had a displacement of about 1,000 tons and a draft of 12 feet. Though smaller than the Merrimac she was of superior strength on account of her heavier guns and armored turrets. The Merrimac was 4,600 tons displacement, was covered with iron plate like a box, and had ten guns, including six nine-inch guns.

It is not generally known that in the summer of 1903 the idea of the all-big-gun ship was conceived in the American Navy and a sketch was submitted for the consideration of the officers in attendance at our War College in Newport, R. I. This plan was discussed at the War College during that summer. In January, 1904, the General Board having considered the suggested plans, requested the department to direct the Bureau of Construction and Repair to prepare tentative de-

signs for a battleship with a battery of twelve heavy turret guns. The letter was referred to this bureau by the Secretary of the Navy, with directions to prepare such design. In September of the same year the General Board asked to be informed by the Bureau of Construction and Repair how soon the tentative design would be completed, but the bureau had been preparing plans for the South Carolina and Michigan on lines similar to those of the Connecticut, with a mixed battery. Finally, in September, 1905, it proposed the all-big-gun design for these ships. In the meantime, however, England had been at work on the British battleship Dreadnaught, the first of her type, which was launched in February, 1906. Had the worth of the suggestion for the Dreadnaught type been appreciated, regardless of the fact that the idea originated outside of the design bureau, the United States would have had the honor, not only of producing the Monitor, but also the first Dreadnaught. As an evidence of what was contemplated, there is now a picture in the War College, painted about 1904, representing the proposed American Dreadnaught at that time.

To give an idea of the strength of the modern Dreadnaught, I will quote from an article by Professor Hollis of Harvard, printed in the February number of the New York Engineering Magazine. He says: "A single one of the American battle fleet lately returned from Europe, in the hands of the Confederacy, would have destroyed the entire Northern Navy. Not a ship, nor any combination of the then existing ships, could have remained on the blockade. The cost of a modern ship must therefore be contrasted with that of our entire navy in the past of only forty years ago, in order to get anything like a fair idea of what should be paid for new ships."

The enlisted force of the navy in 1864 was about the same as it is to-day, while the number of vessels in commission was 683, with a displacement of 500,000 tons, as against 212 vessels in commission in 1910, with a displacement of 790,000 tons.

The navy to-day differs from that of twenty years ago not only in ships and guns, but in men. Few people appreciate the fact that 96 per cent. of the enlisted men to-day are American-born, representing every State in the Union. They have not been seafaring men, but are young men of high intelligence, from every walk of life. As soon as they are enlisted they are sent to a training station where they are taught sanitary care, drilled in the necessary exercises pursuant to their vocation,

and within three months are generally placed on a battleship or other man-of-war. Here they are developed, according to their inclinations and ability, in electricity, machinery, gun-firing and all the requirements of a modern man-of-war, to such an extent that when their enlistments expire they are a valuable asset to the country. The navy increases their productive powers for times of peace and makes them a strong instrument for defense in times of war.

The duties of the officers have also changed materially. The battleship fleet, which is the navy, and to which the country would look in time of trouble, is composed of enormous ships which are floating power plants full of complex machinery. Consequently, it is necessary that the officers should be versed in engineering, as well as seamanship. Roosevelt once said every officer must be a fighting engineer. To command, or to be the executive officer of one of these great moving machine shops, requires technical knowledge, executive ability, mental training, and a physical condition as nearly perfect as possible, in order to be able to stand the strain and responsibility.

One of the most far-reaching acts of our former President, Theodore Roosevelt, was when he issued an order directing our battleship fleet of sixteen vessels to encircle the globe. At the time, the success of this movement was considered by many, but not by him, as problematical and hazardous. No such armada had ever attempted a similar voyage, and there were many critics at home and abroad who were skeptical and opposed to it. However, it was a stupendous success, with far-reaching results. It served as a messenger of peace instead of a menace to the world. It was received with enthusiasm and cordiality everywhere. It impressed the world with the power and skillful handling of the American Navy. The American people were proud of their ships and men, and pleased with the entire success of the cruise.

When I became Secretary of the Navy, I found an organization dating back to the year 1842, when the expenditures were about eight and one-quarter millions of dollars, and the number of sailors and marines were about eleven thousand. In 1842 but 29 vessels were in commission, with a tonnage of 30,000 tons.

In 1910 we expended approximately 135 millions for the navy, had 57,000 sailors and marines, 212 vessels in commission, and a tonnage of nearly 800,000 tons.

I made it a point to study the reports of former Secretaries of the Navy, of Boards, of successful shop and shipbuilding organizations, and the great navies of other countries, and finally adopted in part the recommendations of a commission which had been appointed by Mr. Roosevelt. This commission was presided over by Justice Moody, and included Admiral Mahan, Judge Dayton, the late Paul Morton, Rear Admiral Luce, and Rear Admiral Folger. It was the report of this commission which the Swift Board, appointed by me, used as a basis for the reorganization which is in effect in the Navy Department at the present time. This organization is logical and successful, and the responsibility is now on Congress to make it statutory.

While I was before the Naval Committee recently arguing for two of the latest Dreadnaughts, it was suggested to me by one member that, as battleships' hulls, with their steel construction, did not become unseaworthy, instead of building a 30,000 ton battleship, we might reconstruct three of our 15,000 ton battleships to take the place of the one proposed. This member did not appreciate the fact that if the same old guns were kept on smaller ships, the larger vessel with more modern guns and better armor and more speed could choose her own distance and annihilate the smaller vessels. But even if the reconstructed vessels had the best guns and the same speed as the large modern battleship, the three together could not be maneuvered with the facility that the one large one could. Thus the one large vessel could concentrate its enormous gun fire on the smaller vessels in turn and destroy them in detail.

To reconstruct and bring up to date is a costly and unprofitable undertaking. No one would think of reconstructing a locomotive or a street car after many years of service—then why a battleship, when the result is so poor.

The fleet, if kept up to date and with the proper military efficiency, is an insurance against war. As long as our fleet is efficient and of sufficient size we can be sure that we will not have war.

The object of the present organization in our navy is to maintain the highest military efficiency, that is, a preparedness for war on the part of the fleet.

I have aimed to establish up-to-date business methods in the Department and Navy yards. The result should be economy throughout the entire naval service, with the assurance that whenever a dollar is expended full value will be received.

In order to keep track of what is expended, a new system of bookkeeping has been established by which trial balances can be furnished monthly. This has not been possible heretofore. Cost accounting has been systematized so that hereafter comparisons can be made between the various yards. Stores have been consolidated from seven store accounts into one property account. As a result of all this the Naval Supply Fund is to be abolished and \$2,700,000 is to be turned back into the treasury for general use of the Government.

In navy yards there has been a logical division of work into the divisions of hull and machinery, a system adopted in our successful private shipbuilding plants, as well as in the English and German navies. The abolition of the Bureau of Equipment has been recommended, its duties to be divided logically among the other bureaus. Congress has, however, neglected to do this as yet.

The business of the department has been grouped into four natural divisions, and assigned to each division is an experienced officer who acts as an aid to the Secretary of the Navy. These aids keep him informed and serve as his expert and responsible advisers. They are, the Aid for Operations of the Fleet, who attends to matters never before provided for systematically; the Aid for Inspections, who carries on a systematic and thorough inspection, ashore and afloat, with the object of avoiding large expenditures on vessels which would not be a military asset after the money had been expended; the Aid for Personnel, and the Aid for Material, the latter covering the material bureaus. With this organization and the hopefulness inspired by the motto now adopted that "the fleet is the navy"—"the navy is the fleet"—we find today a healthy spirit of co-ordination in the navy and a zealous aim to get efficiency as well as economy.

Competitions have been introduced into the fleet, not only in gun practice, but also in the consumption of coal and the use of stores. This has resulted in a saving in expenditures and in even higher efficiency.

To give a brief idea of the improved administration of the fleet and the navy yards, the following is interesting: The Paymaster-General of the Navy on comparing the costs of administration of the navy yards for 1910 and 1909, finds that if the gross charges had borne the same ratio to the productive work in 1910 as in 1909, the gross charges would have been proportionately greater by \$3,166,307.

In 1909 there were 196 vessels in commission, and in 1910 there were 212. If the cost of maintenance per ship had been as much in 1910 as it was in 1909, the expenditures afloat, it is calculated, would have been increased \$4,112,321.

The gain in administrative economy and operative efficiency of the navy may be indicated by adding these sums together, showing that but for better business methods \$7,278,628 more would have been spent; in other words, the operating expenses of the navy have been reduced by that amount.

During the year in which this improvement has taken place the number of ships increased about 8 per cent.; the average number of ships actually in commission was increased about 11 per cent.; and the displacement of vessels was increased about 9 per cent.

The power of motive machinery was increased about 16 per cent., and the average cruising speed of the fleet has increased from 10 to 12 knots, without additional consumption of coal.

Thus, greater efficiency has resulted, with more economical administration.

The indicated improvement in economical administration amounts to about 9 per cent. of the total amounts expended for running the navy yards and ships, or 6 per cent. of the total expenditures for the entire year for all purposes.

Ships are now moved in squadrons or fleets, engaged in battle practice, maneuvering and gun firing. Every thing is carried on as though war existed, or might exist at any moment. The principle being that to be prepared for war is to avert war.

Our ships are giving strict attention to self-maintenance and to keeping of vessels in repair by the enlisted men. They only go to the navy yards for docking and for large repairs.

In all these reforms and recommendations I have had the entire endorsement and hearty support of President Taft, without whose aid and sympathy little could have been accomplished. He also is very desirous and keen that we should build two battleships a year.

With the opening of the Panama Canal the importance of the Caribbean Sea as a base of future naval operations will be realized. It is the hope of the department to develop the naval base in the accessible and suitable harbor of Guantanamo, Cuba, which is some 700 miles from the canal, and capable of harboring a fleet of fifty or more men-of-war.

It is important during battle maneuvers in peace, or a period of real hostilities, that a vessel should not be called upon to return two thousand miles in order to be repaired. This can more easily and economically be done by the development of Guantanamo as a docking and repair station. I have recommended to Congress that certain useless naval bases and yards should be abolished, bringing about a saving of about a million and a half dollars annually in maintenance for these yards alone. Congress must assume the responsibility if this is not accomplished, as it requires legislative action.

It is the intention to develop Pearl Harbor, San Francisco Bay, and Puget Sound, in order that, after the Panama Canal has been completed, the entire fleet may be maintained on the Pacific Coast.

I would like you to turn from material to the personnel. In order that our officers may command our important ships while in the prime of life, a personnel bill has been introduced and urged upon Congress which would produce captains at from 43 to 48 years of age, and rear-admirals at 55. It is also desired to add two vice-admirals and an admiral, in order that the commander-in-chief of our great battleship fleet should have a position commensurate in importance with his command, and that he should not, on special occasions, be outranked in foreign ports by an admiral of a single ship or of an inferior navy.

At the present time Congress is in the midst of a discussion as to the method under which ships should be built—whether they should be confined to an eight hour limitation of labor, not only in the Government yards, where eight hour labor is the rule now, but also in private yards. It is interesting to note the extra cost involved if the private yards are driven to an eight hour basis just at the moment when our shipyards are successfully competing with the shipbuilding organizations of the great maritime nations. We know that if the vessels of the building program recommended this year by the President were to be built in the Government navy yards it would cost about \$20,775,000, whereas if built under present conditions of labor in the private ship yards without restriction by an eight hour law, there would be a saving of about five and one-quarter millions of dollars. The battleship Arkansas, which was launched last month at Camden, N. J., was constructed and launched at a cost of four and one-half millions, or one and one-half millions less than the limit of

cost fixed by Congress. The Florida, building at the New York Navy Yard, will cost \$6,400,000, and its cost will exceed by \$2,450,000 that of her sister ship, the Utah (building at a private yard in Camden, N. J., and launched six months ago).

In the case of the new Texas, a thousand tons larger than the Arkansas, with the eight hour provision the department was obliged to accept the one offer of \$5,830,000, an advance in price over that for the Arkansas of \$1,750,000, although the size had only increased a thousand tons. It is estimated that the sister ship of the new Texas (to be called the New York) which Congress provided should be built in a navy yard (which means the New York yard) can not be built for less than \$7,500,000. In other words, if Congress will permit the New York to be built at a private ship yard a saving can be effected, based on the estimate for the Texas, even with the eight hour limit of labor, of \$1,650,000.

The building up of the American navy has brought about many advantageous results to the country. Before the era of the white fleet (1887) a steel ship had not been built in this country. The requirements of the navy and the studies and aid of naval officers brought about the establishment of some of the great steel plants, which are on such a basis to-day that they are able to compete successfully with the world. The new navy is responsible for the education, development and training of a large class of men who enter our industrial world. It has enabled a number of ship yards to exist which could not have continued but for the navy. These yards are invaluable assets to our country and are prepared, when Congress sees fit to encourage our shipping, to build the required merchant marine for the United States, which will be a valuable adjunct to our navy.

All of us are anxious for universal peace, and there are many who feel that it can eventually be brought about by an international supreme court. We must bear in mind, however, that no court can be of any service unless its decrees can be enforced. When the nations agree to an international court, it is certain that five or six of the great nations will be obliged to maintain navies in order that the decrees of the court will be maintained. It will be necessary that no one of those nations shall have a greater or more powerful navy than the combined navies of the other nation members of the court. We may, therefore, feel sure that the American navy in the future, under the most favorable conditions as to peace, will

have to exist. It will have to be ready to do its share in the enforcement of the decrees of this court, if established, when necessary.

With the certainty of an expanding commerce in the future, with our surplus products carried to the world's markets, and with our growing responsibilities in the region of the Panama Canal, a strong navy will be a necessity.

With the permission of the chairman I would like to propose a toast to our battle fleet, whose walls of steel and offensive strength form the Nation's best security.

PRESIDENT LOW.

I am very glad that we are now to hear from the South. The gentleman who will now speak to us is one of those ex-Confederates who has always taken the national point of view, and it gives me most sincere pleasure to present to you Judge Emory Speer, United States District Judge for the Southern District of Georgia.

ADDRESS OF HONORABLE EMORY SPEER

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In the gallant Navy, whose accomplished and invaluable chief has just spoken, there once served the Virginian, Matthew Fontaine Maury. When a young man his "Physical Geography of the Seas," translated into many languages, impelled Humboldt to declare that the young Southerner had founded a new science. He first suggested to Cyrus W. Field the Atlantic cable, and indicated the route upon which it was finally laid. His "Sailing Directions" save many millions annually to the commerce of the world. Once the superintendent of the Naval Observatory in Washington, earning the degree of LL. D. from Cambridge, offered the loftiest scientific stations by Russia and France, like Robert E. Lee he put aside all other honors and returned to Lexington, to aid in the education and training of his country's youth. This "philosopher of the seas" declared that "a straight line drawn from the headwaters of the Amazon to the headwaters of the Mississippi, measures a quadrant of the globe. In the small compass of the West Indian Sea are crowded together the natural outlets of the ocean from mountains, plains and valleys that embrace every variety of production, of every degree of latitude and climate, from perpetual winter to eternal spring. When it is seed time in one basin, it is harvest in the other. The delta of the Mississippi, the mouths of the Hudson and the Amazon are all within ten days sail of the Isthmus. This is the barrier which separates us from six hundred millions of people, three-fourths of the population of the earth. Break it down, therefore, and this country is placed midway between Europe and Asia. The Caribbean becomes the center of the world, and the focus of the world's commerce."

This consummation, which the discoverers, the conquistadors, the philosophers, the emperors, the navigators for centuries past have declared to be essential to civilization, was made possible by the righteous and rigorous diplomacy of the illustrious American who is your guest of honor to-night, and certain by the constant and untiring hand of his great successor, the President of the United States. The President is, of course, primarily entrusted with the national defense. In message to Congress, he declares: "In my judgment it is the right and duty of the United States to fortify and make capable

of defense the work that will bear so vital a relation to its welfare and that is being created solely by it, and at an expenditure of enormous sums."

There are, however, a number of people who take the contrary view. Some of the more distinguished have signed a document which is declared by a magazine of repute as the strongest and most complete statement against the views of the President and the Secretary of War. Some of these are college presidents, some authors, and two ladies noted for their great philanthropy and skill in the use of the pen.

It is true that originally it was not our purpose to fortify the canal. "If the canal be constructed under the common protection of all nations, for equal benefits to all," said President Taylor, in his message to Congress in 1849, "it would be neither just nor expedient that any great maritime state should command the communications."

It will be seen that the conditions mentioned by President Taylor do not and will not exist. Besides, such were the views of men who had not felt the power and responsibilities, or appreciated the dangers of the Nation as it exists to-day. With the final establishment of the solidarity of the nation, there came to its people a new and greater conception of its future. This perhaps was evidenced by the order to concentrate an army of fifty-two thousand men on the banks of the Rio Grande to expel the French from Mexico, by the purchase of the vast hyperborean empire of Alaska, in the practical protectorate of Cuba, the naval station at Guantanamo, the ownership of Porto Rico, the righteous and indispensable acquisition of Hawaii, of Guam, and of the Philippines. And said Captain Cook, the great navigator, in the story of his famous voyage around the world, "The nation that controls Manila, Guam, the Sandwich Islands and San Francisco will in the end control the commerce of the Pacific Ocean."

It was expressive of this ever growing spirit of nationalism that President Hayes, in his special message to Congress of March 8, 1880, declared that "the policy of this country is a canal under American control. The United States cannot consent to the surrender of this control to any European power, or to any combination of European powers." Asiatic powers were not then in the President's contemplation. But of the canal he declared, "It will be virtually a part of the coast line of the United States."

When the President wrote these words, Russia had not

completed the Siberian Railroad. The Russians do not twice make the same mistake. And one has read the history of that mighty and imperturbable people to little purpose, if he deems that their vigorous participation in Eastern questions, and in world questions, is at an end. The mysterious and awful power of Japan was unknown; the incalculable potency of China's unnumbered millions was negligible then. Secretary Seward, who had in 1862 thought the interests of our country in the canal not different from other maritime powers, in 1868 inserted a clause in a new treaty with Colombia, that enemies of the United States should be excluded from the use of the proposed canal in time of war.

It is true that American diplomats did not as yet fully understand the growing purpose of the American people, that the canal itself should be in all respects American. On the 5th of February, 1900, there was drafted a treaty between this country and Great Britain, which adopted the "Constantinople Rules," agreed to invite foreign nations to adhere to it, and prohibited fortifications. Now the Constantinople Rules forbade the fortification of the Suez Canal, even if the Ottoman Empire was a belligerent. This is the more remarkable as the soil was conquered under the reign of Omar, the second Caliph after Mahomet himself. It is interesting to reflect that Farwak or Pelusium, situated on the Isthmus, was the first place in Egypt to which siege was laid by Amru, the poetical but practical general of Omar. With more prescience than was generally possessed by Moslem conquerors, Amru immediately projected a canal across the Isthmus to connect the waters of the Red Sea and the Mediterranean. This plan was condemned by Omar as calculated to throw open Arabia to the maritime invasion of Christians. Had Omar been as wise as our President, suitable fortifications would probably have been suggested and the danger of a "Christian" invasion avoided.

The proposed treaty of 1900 was not ratified. That and all previous drafts contained provisions forbidding us to fortify the canal, or to use our land and naval forces in its defense. But nothing of this sort appears in the treaty now in force.

It must be borne in mind that this was a treaty between the United States and Great Britain alone. We have no treaty upon the subject with any other nation, save Panama. Our title to the route of the canal is unchallenged, and is as clear as our title to the channel of the Hudson or the Mississippi. Other nations are neither parties nor privies to the treaty. It

is true that we have adopted with Great Britain certain rules as a basis to make the canal neutral. It is true if other nations, not parties to the treaty, become belligerent *inter se*, we will be morally bound to keep the canal neutral as to them. And by the treaty with Great Britain we are made the sole guarantors of that neutrality. But that guaranty could not be kept by lock-tenders or other civil officials of the canal. To enforce neutrality, and especially to perform the duties of sole guarantor, requires military force, and strong force. To-night, under the silent stars, on long stretches of prairie by the murmuring waters of the Rio Grande, there rides rifle in hand many an American lad with every sensibility of his warlike soul alert, to enforce the principles of our country's neutrality between the warring Mexicans.

Neutrality is not impotency. To deny to our country the use of its mighty guns in proper emplacements, on every essential coign of vantage, on and about the canal, would be greater folly than to strip our sentinel on the Mexican line, of his revolver, his rifle and his horse. And our forces on the canal will not be there to maintain neutrality alone. Theirs is the duty to guard the safety of the nation. Shall we stand idle while the potent fleets of our enemy may swiftly sweep through the canal and attack, ravage, lay under contribution or seize possession of either coast of our country. Ours the danger, and ours the duty. No other nation, not even Great Britain, guarantees neutrality for us. If then we are belligerents and helpless, a hostile fleet might blow up the locks and destroy the canal without violating the rule of international law. Or, what is more dangerous, our enemy may himself fortify and hold the canal, an incomparable naval base, to extort from us terms humiliating to American honor, and destructive to our power among the nations of the earth.

Besides, the tenure by which we hold the zone traversed by the canal is that of unquestioned sovereignty. The treaty with Panama gives to the United States forever, all rights and authority to the exclusion of Panama of any sovereign power; it expressly conveys to the United States the right to use its land and naval forces, or to establish fortifications for the safety and protection of the canal.

It is, however, urged by some, whom Robbie Burns might have termed "the unco guid and rigidly righteous," that the Republic of Panama itself was the result of a revolution. True —so was the Republic of the United States. These revolutions

were successful. They made nations, and both have been recognized as equally independent nations by all of the great powers of earth. It is urged that we took over the path of the canal as the result of our preponderating force. This is not altogether true. But let it be granted. It is the usual way. Within the memory of many present, much more ungently did Prussia acquire Schleswig-Holstein, under the "blood and iron rule" of Bismarck. We paid Panama for a strip of her national domain ten million dollars, and are to pay her much more. With the volleys from her needle guns Prussia took all of Schleswig-Holstein and paid nothing, and yet the Baltic Canal from Kiel to the mouth of the Elbe, is every foot through the soil thus taken by arms. And while this canal can be used for the commerce of the world, it is fortified with that impregnable thoroughness which is characteristic of the great warrior nation, Germany.

The negotiations which established our right to fortify, are made singularly clear by Senate Document No. 746, entitled "History of the Amendments Proposed to the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty." These were presented by your own brilliant Senator, Mr. Root, and published less than a month ago. This important paper had been prepared in the Department of State by the lamented John Hay, in his glorious service there. It has probably not as yet been carefully considered by the gentlemen, and by the ladies, who have reached the conclusion that it is righteous for our country, at enormous cost, to establish upon our own soil, a pathway for all nations to our most vulnerable and most populous ports, and yet altogether unrighteous to take the ordinary methods to prevent its use by our enemies, no matter how powerful, how merciless or savage they may be.

That the proposition to fortify was up and fully considered by Mr. Hay and the Marquis of Lansdowne is undeniable. Of the clause forbidding it, Mr. Hay, contemporaneously declares, "This has now been omitted."

Lord Lansdowne, representing the mother country, notwithstanding the immovable attitude of the Senate, as beautiful and proper from our brethren in blood, does not close the negotiations. A new draft of treaty has been made. His Lordship's letter, of August 3, 1901, and memorandum discussing this new draft, addressed to the Foreign Office in London, are most illuminative. His Lordship wrote: "Among other things, there is no stipulation, as originally in rule 7, prohibiting the erection of fortifications commanding the canal

or the waters adjacent." This is as clear as his Lordship's lucid English can make it, but this is not all. In a subsequent paragraph, in the same clause, his Lordship continues: "In my despatch I pointed out the dangerous ambiguity of an instrument of which one clause permitted the adoption of defensive measures, while another prohibited the erection of fortifications. It is most important that no doubt should exist as to the intention of the contracting parties. As to this, I understand that by the omission of all reference to the matter of defense, the United States Government desires to reserve the power of taking measures to protect the canal, at any time when the United States may be at war, from destruction or damage at the hands of an enemy or enemies." He thus acknowledges and does not contravene the American purpose. He continues: "On the other hand, I conclude that, with the above exception, there is no intention to derogate from the principles of neutrality laid down by the rules. As to the first of these propositions, I am not prepared to deny that the contingencies may arise when, not only from a national point of view, but on behalf of the commercial interests of the whole world, it might be of supreme importance to the United States that they should be free to adopt measures for the defense of the canal at a moment when they were themselves engaged in hostilities."

Of those commercial interests, Great Britain before long will have the lion's share, and is not unwilling, it seems, to entrust its protection to Uncle Sam if he is behind his fortifications.

Possibly the British Plenipotentiary had read the remark made at Bunker Hill, and ascribed by Washington Irving to General Putnam. Said "Old Put," as the patriots were planning their fight, "Americans are never afraid of their heads, they only think of their legs; shelter them and they will fight forever."

It should never be forgotten that Great Britain from the first sought to prohibit the fortification of the canal, but when we became the sole guarantor, it withdrew and abandoned that prohibition. It was then, to use the language of Lord Lansdowne, "thought entirely fair to omit the prohibition that no fortifications should be erected commanding the canal or the waters adjacent."

Are other considerations necessary to establish the legal, moral and ethical right of our country to protect this vast acquisition? Is the commerce of the whole world, for the neu-

trality of which within the canal we now become guarantor, so free from difficulties and intricacies, that we can rely upon the civil servants of the Government to enforce this obligation? Is not the honor of the Nation pledged? Is not its dignity, character and influence at stake? Will not the nerve center of international strategy be located there at the instant of the first successful passage through its locks and channel of a mighty battleship from either ocean to the other? Are we now so isolated that we may safely give no heed to the perfect militarism, and the gigantic steel clad squadrons of the grand old world beyond the deep? Can we afford to ignore the uncounted millions, and the racial animosities of resurgent Asia? Do we appreciate the astounding mobility of modern fleets and armies? Innumerable are the illustrations of the superiority of the fire from permanent fortifications over guns however powerful fired from the unstable platform of the restless sea. It is true that strong fleets sometimes run past them, but save with incompetent defenders is it not true that in a stand up fight, they make little impression on properly armed fortifications. Is it not true that the French batteries on the Mediterranean headlands, against all the daring attacks of Nelson himself, made safe the supply by sea, of Napoleon's Italian army; that at Copenhagen, though the Danish fleet was taken, sunk, or destroyed, Nelson was saved only by an artful truce, that to the end of the fight Tre Kroner battery "continued to exert with unabated vigor its giant strength." Did not Admiral Togo himself fail before the seaward batteries of the Russians at Port Arthur? Did not every night find his fleet one hundred miles at sea, with a picket line of torpedo boats, and another of cruisers between him and the fortress? Have Americans forgotten Sir Peter Parker's attack on Charleston, and how the stout palmetto logs of Fort Moultrie, and the stouter hearts of its defenders, drove Sir Peter away?

Has the sustained assault upon Charleston by the iron-clad fleet of the Union been forgotten? Can we not recall the story of Wagner, of Moultrie, of Sumter, and how the Georgians and Carolinians with their crumbling defenses, their imperfect ordnance, and faulty ammunition, for four years dominated the channel of the harbor, and immovably held their works, until the northward sweep of Sherman's army caused them to withdraw and add their numbers to Johnston's gallant remnant. Said Rear-Admiral Rodgers, "No ship of the navy entered the harbor of Charleston, even after Sumter was in

ruins, its fire silenced, and the batteries of Morris Island in our possession. The harbor was a cul-de-sac, a circle of fire which could not be passed." And of the men behind the guns, I do declare that the country may now add to the numbers, and the military virtues of the gallant youth of the North, the descendants of that heroic strain who for so long against such powerful armament and such gallant adversaries held the famous Carolina city.

And shall we forget the very inspiration of our national anthem itself? How "By Patapsco's billowy dash," all the day long Fort McHenry desperately fought and held at bay the fierce and furious Britons from the very doors of thousands of American homes:

"And the rockets' red glare, the bombs bursting in air,
Gave proof through the night, that our flag was still there.
'Tis the star-spangled banner, O long may it wave,
O'er the land of the free, and the home of the brave."

PRESIDENT LOW.

I am going to introduce the next speaker in two words, because those two words signify more that I honor and admire than any other language that I can command—Theodore Roosevelt. (Long applause, three cheers and the tiger.)

ADDRESS OF EX-PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Mr. President, and my Fellow Members and Friends:

I am deeply touched by your greeting and thank you for it. (Applause.) If there could have been anything wanting on this occasion when I am to meet you, my fellow citizens of the city where I was born, it was supplied by having present and speaking as you have just heard him speak a man from the State where my mother and my mother's people were born; for I am half a Georgian, Judge, and it made me feel very proud to sit here and listen before you New Yorkers to the Georgian who teaches us that Georgian and New Yorker alike are Americans first and foremost. (Applause.)

I want to speak a word or two on a couple of topics not suggested by my theme before I touch on that. I want to say how glad I am to hear the way in which the club, the members of the club here to-night, have responded to the two appeals made to them to uphold the hands of President Taft (terrific applause), both in his effort to secure reciprocity with Canada and in his effort to secure the fortification of the Panama Canal. (Applause.)

And in addition to what has been said about reciprocity with Canada I would like to make this point: It should always be a cardinal point in our foreign policy to establish the closest and most friendly relations of equal respect and advantage with our great neighbor on the north. (Applause.) And I hail the reciprocity arrangement because it represents an effort to bring about a closer, a more intimate, a more friendly relationship of mutual advantage on equal terms between Canada and the United States. (Applause.)

It was a pleasure to hear the able Secretary of the Navy, who has done so much for the navy, allude to the voyage of the battle fleet. When I was going through Europe last spring it interested me to find that the two things done by America during the last ten years that had most vividly impressed not only the imagination of the people, but the minds of the great statesmen and sovereigns of Europe, were the voyage of the battle fleet and the building of the Panama Canal; because mind you, gentlemen, foreigners do not care a rap what we say about our own greatness; they are utterly unaffected by any Fourth of July oration; but they care a great deal for proof

that we are able by deed to make good our words. (Applause.) Until we sent the fleet of battleships around the world foreign nations felt sure we could not do it, because they did not think they could; and it opened the eyes of all of them to what our fleet was. I take a certain half humorous pleasure in looking back to the comments made by the press of my native city upon both those enterprises when I initiated them. Do you remember the double headed editorials, that "the fleet shall not leave the Eastern coast;" but it did leave the Eastern coast (laughter). And I remember one prominent United States Senator, in an interview, saying that there was not enough money to take the fleet around the world, and that it should not go, as no money would be given. As I then explained, there was enough money to take the fleet out to the Pacific, and it was going to the Pacific; then if the Senator in question did not wish it to return, why it would stay in the Pacific. The fleet went, and the money came, and the fleet returned. Now, the Judge has told you of the protest made by those very worthy ladies of both sexes (applause and laughter)—I am using the most respectful terms that are compatible with truthfulness—against the fortification of the canal. The Judge also read to you the recently published documents containing the statements of the British official representatives, their Cabinet Minister and their Ambassador, as to our right to fortify the Canal. I can add to that my own personal experience. I had as Governor made a public statement in opposition to the treaty as drawn up in 1900, stating that I trusted it would not be adopted, because it invited other powers to join with us in guaranteeing the neutrality of the canal, and because it prohibited our fortifying the canal. I became President, by the lamentable chance of the assassin's bullet. Just prior to the signing of the second treaty, the treaty under which we are now acting, and Mr. Hay came to me at once, almost as soon as I had reached Washington, certainly within a few weeks, and said that he wanted to talk with me over the proposed Panama treaty with Great Britain. I said, Mr. Secretary, does it meet the two requirements that I said I laid down? He answered yes, and he showed me the letters from Lord Lansdowne and Lord Pauncefote, explicitly recognizing our right to fortify the canal. He showed me the correspondence from which the Judge has read, and immediately afterwards I received Lord Pauncefote and told him how glad I was that the treaty had been arranged as it was, because if there had

been any question of the right of the United States to fortify the canal I would never have consented to send the treaty to the Senate. He said he understood this perfectly, and that his government had explicitly stated that the treaty in no way debarred the United States from fortifying the canal if it so desired. Then came the treaty with Panama, in which we outright received the right to fortify; it gave me great pleasure to hear the Judge speak of our treaty with Panama.

By the way, if there ever was any act of my administration for which I felt there was absolute ethical justification, it was the handling of that Panama situation. (Applause.) To let yourself be held up by bandits does not show good nature. It shows timidity. I did not intend that any set of bandits should hold up Uncle Sam. (Laughter and applause.) But I did intend that Uncle Sam should behave with absolute justice, and with more than justice, with generosity toward the weaker neighbor with which he dealt; and although the Republic of Panama could exist only by virtue of the guarantee of neutrality that we gave, yet we scrupulously treated Panama just as we would have treated the most powerful country on the face of the earth.

If there is a great work that must be done, a nation can only take one of two positions: that it will do it, or that it won't interfere with any one else doing it. Now, we took the position that we would not have any one but ourselves dig the Panama Canal. Good; I was glad we took it, but when we took that position we had to dig it ourselves. And my friends, I ask you to think of what the feeling of this country would be if we yielded to the demands of maudlin sentimentality and declined to fortify that canal, and some power that was about to go to war with us—for it might act first—or was at war with us, seized the canal. Do you suppose that a power engaged in a life and death struggle with us would hesitate to act in any way that would hurt us most? Of course not. Mind you, no power except England and Panama is bound to respect the neutrality of the canal. If we ever get engaged in war, we would need be thrice foolish if we did not understand that we have to be prepared to defend ourselves from an attack on whatever was vital to our interests. (Applause.) Fortunately for us as a nation, the foolish people who protest against the fortification of the Panama Canal will fail in their effort, and the canal will be fortified; for if it were not, and this country were ever at war, our children's children would hold in execra-

tion and as infamous forever, the memory of those men, and especially those public men, who prevented the United States from guaranteeing its honor and its interest by fortifying the Panama Canal. (Applause.)

To-night we are gathered to do honor to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, and to me has been assigned the duty of speaking of Lincoln and progressive democracy. I speak of progressive democracy in its genuine sense; for the Republican party was founded as the genuine progressively democratic party of this country. (Applause.)

The founders of our Government, the men who made the Constitution and who signed the Declaration of Independence, tended to divide into two groups, those under Hamilton, who believed in a strong and efficient government, but who distrusted the people; and those under Jefferson, who did not believe in a strong or efficient government, but who in a certain sense did trust the people—although it was really distrust of them to keep the government weak. And therefore for decades we oscillated between the two tendencies, and could not develop the genuine strength that a democracy should have until Abraham Lincoln arose, until he and the men with him founded the Republican party on the union of the two ideas of combining efficient governmental force with genuine and whole-hearted trust in the people. (Applause.)

In the fine oration of Dr. Gunsaulus, to which we have listened to-night, he has pointed out something that I wish not only every man here, but all men in similar gatherings throughout this Union, would remember. He has pointed out the fact that in every great crisis the genuine representative of the men who made the progressive movement in the last great crisis, is the man who is true to the *spirit* of that movement, and who is ready when necessary to ignore its letter in favor of its spirit. (Applause.)

Let me just work out that idea with you for a moment. If the Baron who signed Magna Charta had refused to sign it and had confined himself to praising the deeds of King Alfred, he would not have been a progressive baron. What he had to do was to apply to his own days the spirit that actuated King Alfred in his days. The men who signed the Declaration of Independence were the heirs of those who made Magna Charta; but if they had confined themselves to re-establishing the principles of Magna Charta, we would not be an independent nation to-day. They were the heirs of the men of Magna

Charta in spirit, and therefore they did not confine themselves to praise of Magna Charta, and refused to go beyond it. They applied the principles which had stood for progress during the early thirteenth century to the needs of the late eighteenth century, and therefore they in their turn made progress. To stand still and refuse to go beyond the point reached by the thirteenth century men would have meant Bourbonism in the nineteenth century.

Abraham Lincoln was the real heir of George Washington. The men of Lincoln's generation were true heirs of the men of the revolution, of the men who made and adopted the Constitution just because they applied the old principles according to the new methods necessary in order adequately to meet the new and changed conditions. They showed themselves to be the heirs of the great men of the past, because they met the problems of the present, not by refusing to use other methods than those that had solved the problems of the past, but by using the new methods necessary in order that the old principles could be applied to the new needs.

Abraham Lincoln and his associates founded the Republican party as a progressive party, as a party of dynamics, not a party of statics. It was not formed to keep unchanged the old methods which had served so well two generations before, in the face of new conditions which those old methods were unfit to meet. That attitude was the attitude taken by the cotton Whigs—excellent gentlemen, good, conservative, high minded gentlemen who did not trust the people, and were afraid of meeting the new issues. Dr. Gunsaulus has shown how that brilliant, although hopelessly erratic friend of freedom, Wendell Phillips, followed Mr. Everett around when Mr. Everett was engaged in the vain effort to show that Lincoln was a firebrand and a danger, and that the new problems before the American people did not need any new methods to solve them. The men of Mr. Everett's type to-day revere Lincoln because he is dead, but object to anyone who is alive who follows Lincoln's lead. We to-day can show our loyalty to Abraham Lincoln and his fellows; can show that that loyalty is not merely a loyalty of the lips, but a loyalty of the heart, by applying their principles to the living issues of the present; not by confining ourselves to praising them for the way they applied those principles to issues that are dead.

Now, another thing: I have used the word "progressive." I regard it as absolutely essential that the Republican party

should be the party of progress, should be the progressive party. But I do not believe, and you do not believe, in making terminology into a fetisch. Abraham Lincoln was progressive compared to Buchanan and Fillmore; compared to Wendell Phillips and John Brown he was conservative; and he was right in both positions. In other words, Abraham Lincoln recognized the fact that in working out a great and lasting reform there is need of both trace work and breeching work. You must drag the wagon along when it needs dragging, and if it starts to go down hill too fast you have got to hold back. Let me illustrate just what I mean by speaking of a matter in Congress as to which there seems to have been wide divergence among Republicans, the proposed constitutional amendment providing for the election of Senators by popular vote.

Now, I am one of those who emphatically believe in the election of Senators by popular vote. (Applause.) At present, they are trying the other system (laughter), with singularly ill success at Albany. By popular vote, at least we would know whether we could or could not elect any one.

Our ultra-conservative friends speak with bated breath, with horror, over the proposed change. I ask their attention and yours to the fact that the proposal to change the election of Senators into direct election by the people, is only a proposal to make, as regards Senators, the change we have already made as regards President. The founders of the Constitution had not advanced as far as Abraham Lincoln had. That is not to their discredit in the least. As Dr. Gunsaulus pointed out, the men who made Magna Charta would not have known what to make of the Declaration of Independence, or of the Constitution of the United States; too many centuries lay ahead of them. What the men of Runnymede did was to meet in a spirit of sane progressiveness the needs of their own day; they met them in the right spirit; and it was for the men of a subsequent day to show the same spirit, and meet different needs. Now, the men who founded our government, who founded the Constitution, felt that it would not be safe to allow the people directly to elect either the President or the Senators; remember, I am not blaming them in the least; they were wise to go ahead slowly; but we would be very foolish not in our turn to keep on going ahead. They felt that the people ought to be contented with electing Congressmen, and for two or three elections the electoral college functioned in accordance with that theory, until a very great danger arose in connection with

the first election of Mr. Jefferson, when Aaron Burr, whom nobody had thought of for President, came within one electoral vote of being made President. We have changed that system so completely that we now have what is, in actual practice, a direct election for President. The members of the electoral college no longer have any function except registering the popular will.

Now the proposal to elect the Senators by popular vote is nothing whatever but a proposal to continue the same movement as regards the Senators that the country has put through as regards the President; and to me it seems an idle absurdity to talk of its being a danger to give to the people the same chance to vote directly for one house of the Legislature that they had from the beginning in voting for the other house of the Legislature, and that they have insisted upon assuming in voting for President. (Applause.) But unfortunately, in their zeal for that principle, some advocates of it in Washington have, in order to get votes for it, coupled with it a provision that, so far from being progressive, is in a high degree, retrogressive. I mean the provision depriving the United States of part of its present authority over the election of Senators. A Senator is elected by a State; but he takes his oath of allegiance not to that State, but to all the United States. The Senator from Georgia, when he takes his oath, becomes my representative, Judge, exactly as he is yours. The Senator from New York when he takes his oath becomes your representative, Doctor, just as much as he is mine. The Senators are officers of the United States Government, and the whole people of the United States are concerned in their election, and I hold that it is an unpardonable act of retrogression to diminish by a fingerweight the power of the United States in passing upon and controlling the election of Senators of the United States. (Applause.)

Now, friends, I want to take another illustration. I am not going to keep you very long. You are very patient. (Cries of go on, go on.) I want to take another illustration. In 1777 the founders of the Constitution met to adopt the Constitution. They met—as has been admirably pointed out in certain masterly decisions by Judge Speer—they met primarily because it had been found, by actual experience, that to allow the commerce between the States and among the States to be controlled by the whim of each State resulted in absolute chaos. The Constitution conferred absolutely unlimited and absolute-

ly exclusive powers upon the national government to control all inter-state commerce. The power could not be more explicitly given. I do not ask for a particle of increase of this power by the national government. All I ask is that it exercise efficiently that power by creating the instruments necessary to meet the totally changed conditions of to-day. (Applause.)

Our people as a whole are resolutely bent that the power shall be exercised. If the United States as a whole does not exercise it the States will begin to try to exercise it themselves. If they do so, then sooner or later, and absolutely inevitably, the Supreme Court will decide that no State can directly or indirectly control interstate commerce within its boundaries. The Supreme Court will decide, because it will have to decide, under the plainest doctrines of the Constitution, that no State can accomplish this by subterfuge or by indirection any more than it can do it by direction. The United States Government must alone exercise this power.

People ask me why we should exercise control over big corporations and not over small corporations? I think the answer is perfectly easy. All of us here deal in our private capacities with a good many different men, with the grocer, the carpenter, the blacksmith, the butcher and a number of other men; and we are able to get along perfectly well with them because they are just about our size. As regards our relations with them substantially the old methods and old principles of a century or two centuries ago still obtain. If one of us is dealing with a grocer and the grocer does not give him good stuff for his money, he changes the grocer; and if he does not pay the grocer, the grocer won't sell him anything.

This is all right, because the grocer has a great many customers, and there are a good many grocers; you can change from one to the other, and he can avoid the customers that do not pay their bills. But supposing the grocer becomes a captain of industry and extends his business so that, whatever it is, coal, oil, railroads, sugar, whatever it is, it is a business that extends over a great many different States. Then he inevitably joins with others and a great corporation is formed, a great artificial individual; and we can none of us deal adequately with that individual because we are no longer dealing with somebody of our own size; we are dealing with somebody immensely larger than ourselves. We can change the grocer; but if there is only one railway and we want to go on a journey, we must go on that railway; we cannot walk; and if we

want to ship out goods we must ship them by that railroad. If a corporation controls practically all of a given commodity, or enough to determine the price of that commodity, we have to deal with that corporation whether we like it or not.

This means that we can deal under the ordinary conditions of competition with the smaller men around us, with the men of our own size in the ordinary relations of life, but when we come to a great artificial creation of the law, a great corporation, which does business on an enormous scale in a great many States, there is no one of us big enough to deal with it by himself. Accordingly we have to invoke the aid of the only entity that is big enough to deal with it, and that is Uncle Sam. Uncle Sam's method of dealing with the great corporation should in principle be just precisely like our method of dealing with the individual grocer or butcher or baker or carpenter. In the first place Uncle Sam should insist upon having justice done to him, done to the people; and in the next place he should be scrupulous in doing justice in return to the corporation. It is just as it is with us in private life. When Uncle Sam deals with a railway he ought to behave just as one of us does with his grocer or baker. If we cheat the grocer out of his money he cannot go on with the business; and on the other hand if we decline to look at his bills, it does not show soundness of heart on our part; it shows weakness of head. Uncle Sam should deal with a railway for instance just in the same way. He should be scrupulous so to treat it that it can have an ample return, that the investor shall have ample return on the investment; if there is any doubt it should be resolved in favor of the investors. But Uncle Sam should have, and gentlemen, don't forget that the American people are bound that he shall have the power to get fair play in return and to get it not as a favor but as a right. (Applause.)

And friends, this movement for fair play, this movement for juster conditions—conditions which shall be such that in this country a man shall have a living wage for his work, and that there shall be square treatment of every man by big corporations—this movement should not become, and if we are wise we will not permit it to become, a contest of the have-nots against the haves. I should mourn beyond measure if the progressive movement became a movement led by violent men who hoped personally to profit by it; and I ask you here and the men like you to take the lead in that movement just because I wish to see it led as the great anti-slavery

movement was led, as the great movement for the union of the country was led, by men who hoped for no personal gain from the success of their principles, but who acted as they did act only because they felt it burning in their souls to respond to the demands made for compliance with the immutable laws of righteousness.

Friends, I believe in perfecting every governmental instrument, I believe in passing every law that will make this more genuinely a government of the people, more genuinely a government of justice; that will enable us more and more surely to drive special privilege out of every stronghold. I believe in passing such laws; but woe to us as a people if we think that we shall be saved by laws alone. South of us there have been and there are now certain republics in Central America and in northern South America where they have had exactly our constitution, practically exactly our laws, where on paper their system has been just like ours, but where the results have worked out as differently from ours as night is different from day, because the men behind the laws have been totally different. No law that can be devised by the wit of man will avail unless the average citizen is a decent man who believes in the fundamental and primary virtues of courage, of honesty and of common sense. And you here, you here like all the rest of our people, have upon you a great burden; you have more than the burden of the success of this nation, great though that burden is.

Two things struck me especially as I talked with the people of the different sections of Europe last spring. Wherever I went I found that the oppressed man, the man who felt that artificial conditions made his life hard for him, the man who felt that he received less than justice, and that he did not get the full chance to which he was entitled, the chance to develop his talents and to show the stuff of which he was made—I found that such a man always looked toward America as the golden land of promise, the land that had at least partially realized the ideal of fair and just treatment as between man and man.

But, together with that feeling I found another, which made me feel as sad as the first made me feel proud; for together with that feeling went the feeling of doubt as to whether we really had in this country realized the goal that we had set ourselves out to realize. Every time a story of business or political corruption or of lawless violence among us is sent

to the other side, it is a subject for sneering mirth on the part of every reactionary, on the part of every foe of popular government; and it saddens the hearts of those who hope that we here in America shall be able to show that the Democratic experiment on a gigantic scale can succeed, and that people can govern themselves and yet act, not only with justice toward one another, but with honesty in their private and in their public relations. I suppose if we do not act as we ought to for the sake of ourselves and for our children, if our pride in our own future, and in our own nation, is not sufficient to make us upright and honest in public and private relations, that it is useless to appeal to other motives; and yet, oh, my friends gathered here to-night, I feel that we are bound to conduct ourselves with honest aggressive and fearless honesty, that we are bound to make this republic a success—not merely in the things of the body, but as regards the things of the spirit—not only for our own sakes, and for the sake of our children, of the children that are to come after us, but because if this republic falls, we shall have dimmed forever the bright and golden hopes of the watching nations of mankind.

